REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 623 JC 670 804

LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES AND THE BEGINNING JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT, REPORT FROM THE SOUTHEAST REGIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM.

BY- MADDOX, MARTHA AND OTHERS
FLORIDA ST. UNIV., TALLAHASSEE
FLORIDA UNIV., GAINESVILLE

PUB DATE 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.52 63P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, *ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITY, *PRESIDENTS, BOARD ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, ADMINISTRATOR CHARACTERISTICS, LEADERSHIP, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP,

THE CONFEREES HEARD NINE PAPERS ON TOPICS OF CONCERN TO AN IN-COMING PRESIDENT. THEY COVERED (1) GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR LEADERSHIP, (2) DUTIES OF THE BOARD AS RELATED TO THE PRESIDENT, (3) SUGGESTIONS FOR ESTABLISHING THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM, (4) SELECTION OF THE TEACHING STAFF, (5) DEVELOPMENT OF THE IN-SERVICE TEACHER PROGRAMS, (6) THE PLACE OF THE FACULTY IN COLLEGE GOVERNMENT, (7) AN EXAMPLE OF BUDGET PREPARATION, (8) THE VALUE OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PUBLIC RELATIONS, AND (9) PRESS RELATIONS. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED013623

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 1 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

and the

BEGINNING JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT

Report from the Southeastern
Junior College Leadership
Program.

JC 670 804

LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES
AND THE
BEGINNING JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT

report from the
SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL
JUNIOR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

sponsored jointly by the
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY AND UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

under grant from the
W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

Additional copies available from:
Raymond E. Schultz
Department of Higher Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

INDEX

Page

FOREWORD. iii

Addresses:

"A Concept of Administrative Leadership" by Doak S. Campbell 1

"Duties of the Board and Its Relation to the College Administrator" by Doak S. Campbell . . . 9

"The Junior College President and the Instructional Program" by Raymond E. Schultz . . 13

"Selection of Instructional Staff" by W. A. Hunt 31

"Developing an In-Service Program" by James L. Wattenbarger 35

"Faculty Policies" by Charles R. Foster 39

"Junior College Budget" by W. A. Hunt 43

"Public Relations in the Junior College" by Laurence R. Campbell 48

"Getting Along with the Press" by Miss Ruth Peeling 57

FOREWORD

In the two-year period 1963-65 some 200 junior college presidents were employed in the United States. The vast majority of individuals were new in the role of junior college president. This publication has been reproduced as an aid to those individuals.

The contents of this publication are from the proceedings of an Institute for Recently Appointed Junior College Presidents and Their Wives held several years ago at Boone, North Carolina. That institute was conducted as an activity of the Southeastern Junior College Leadership Program jointly directed by Florida State University and the University of Florida with support from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

A second Institute for Newly Appointed Junior College Presidents and Their Wives is being held this summer at Ferrum (Virginia) Junior College as an activity of the Southeastern Junior College Leadership Program. It was decided that the proceedings of this initial institute would provide valuable resource material for this second institute. Further, we felt that other newly appointed junior college presidents would also find this material beneficial. As a result, a copy is being sent each president appointed in 1964 and thereafter who is new in that role. This is made possible by funds received from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Major credit for the editing and preparation of the initial proceedings is due Mrs. Martha Maddox, Dr. J. O. Carson, and Dr. Marvin L. Baker.

Raymond E. Schultz
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University
and
Co-director of the Southeastern Junior College Leadership Program

August 1965

A CONCEPT OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

*Doak S. Campbell

Since the beginning of higher education in the United States the president has necessarily been a central figure. Several thousands of individuals have served as directing heads of institutions great and small. Some have achieved great distinction; others have served their day and have passed from the scene with little notice. The powers, duties and responsibilities of presidents have been the object of much discussion and concern.

Suggestions are made in season and out of season that the functions of the president be changed in one way or another. A few say they should be extended; some insist that they be curtailed or modified.

While our concern here applies specifically to the presidents of junior colleges, the qualities that make for administrative leadership in higher education are essentially the same for all types of institutions. In order that we may view our subject in proper historical perspective, we note some of the changes in the administration of higher institutions that have taken place.

Until the middle of the nineteenth century all of the colleges were small. They had few teachers, small student bodies, few buildings, and limited curricula. The president knew intimately the members of the faculty. He knew rather well all of the students. He was familiar with the various subjects in the curriculum. He usually did his share of the teaching. The financial needs were small although it was his responsibility to see to it that these needs were met. His duties were somewhat like those of the head of a large household.

However, during the past hundred years many higher institutions have increased in size and complexity, and with this increase have come increasing demands on the time and the energies of the president.

---

*Dr. Doak S. Campbell is President Emeritus of Florida State University and former Graduate Dean of George Peabody College. For some twelve years while he was president of Central College, a junior college in Conway, Arkansas, Dr. Campbell served as executive secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

The office of the president, by one name or another, goes back to the earliest of the universities. And, for the greater part, the duties and responsibilities, at base, have been very much the same. We are told that in the University of Paris in early medieval times the retiring master, when inducting a new master into the headship gave him a biretta as a badge of authority, a ring as a symbol of his espousal of science, a book in recognition of the fact that knowledge is to be acquired and transmitted, a kiss as a token of affection, and a benediction.[1]

Under a wide variety of names such as master, rector, chancellor, provost, principal, proctor, we find a common core of duties and responsibilities that go with the headship of an institution of higher learning. The term, president, is used in a large majority of higher institutions in North America, while the term, rector, is most widely used in other parts of the world.

With respect to legal responsibility, there has been little change since the fifteenth century. The chief administrative officer is responsible to a corporation which has been instituted by special charter granted in accordance with state law. The corporate body is usually designated as a Board of Trustees, Board of Regents, Board of Visitors, Board of Fellows, or Board of Overseers. Such bodies are empowered to appoint teachers, hold title to property, administer financial affairs, receive benefactions and other funds, confer degrees, and determine general policies for operation.

The powers, responsibilities and duties conferred upon the president by such governing bodies are usually defined by statute, by statement of policy by the board, by charter, by-laws, or constitution. As a rule, such definitions are quite general in character although in a considerable number of cases they are delineated in great detail. In recent years there appears to be a trend among boards for public institutions to codify statements of policy including the powers, duties and responsibilities of the president.

Thwing[2] presents the duties and responsibilities of the president in terms of relations between that officer and

---

[1] Thwing, Charles F., The College President, MacMillan, New York, 1926, p. vii.

[2] *Ibid*.

(1) Trustees, (2) Faculty, (3) Students, (4) Graduates, (5) Churches, (6) Secondary and Graduate Schools, (7) Other Presidents, (8) The Press, and (9) The General Community. The catalog of specific functions in relation to maintaining suitable relationship with these important groups presents a staggering volume of activity which no one person could possibly engage in satisfactorily.

Flexner[3] takes a dim view of American universities on all counts, particularly their administration:

> But it is quite obvious that the institutions which we have used for purposes of illustration--the best we possess--are not organisms; they are merely administrative aggregations, so varied, so manifold, so complex that administration itself is reduced to budgeting, student accounting, advertising, etc.

Having paid his respects to American universities, Flexner then described the duties of the president:

> The duties of the president are various and exacting; he is the main agent in procuring funds or appropriations; he is a local magnate; he is pulled hither and yon to make speeches and attend functions; he is made member of numerous community committees and councils; he is a 'good fellow' among the alumni; he participates more or less actively in choosing the faculty and mapping out policies for the colleges, policies for the service station, policies for the graduate and professional schools. He is the medium of communication between faculty and trustees; unless he approves, the faculty views may not even obtain a hearing. A heavy burden! One of the wisest of American philanthropists, head of a great business organization, long a trustee of a prominent university, once remarked to me: 'A man may be president of a transcontinental railroad, an international banking corporation, a far-flung business; but the presidency of a great university is an impossible post.'[4]

Although Flexner's stimulating treatise roundly condemns the organizational paraphernalia with which the president must deal, he sees no way to avoid the multitude of activities that are imposed upon the president. He believes that an unwieldy faculty cannot manage a university. In fact, he points out that, while faculty government would be democratic, the best minds on the faculty would stay with the laboratory and their studies while inferior persons would tend to be in control.

---

[3] Flexner, Abraham, Universities, American, English, German. Oxford University Press, 1930, p. 179.

[4] Ibid., p. 183.

Writing a generation after the Flexner critique, Chancellor Capen, himself a veteran in higher education, finds that significant changes have taken place since the beginnings of higher education in America.

> But a change has come over the office of the president which is unrelated to the change in the professional background of the majority of the incumbents. The early American college was not only the child of the church, it was the product of an authoritarian age. Its form of government was essentially autocratic. After the United States had become a republic with increasingly democratic tendencies the pattern did not change. New foundations were organized on the same model with the same concentration of authority. The trustees were the sovereigns and the president was their viceroy; a viceroy with full regal powers, since the sovereigns seldom visited their realm. In the president's hands were the high justice, the middle and the low. He controlled teachers, students, and curriculum. He managed the property. He carried on all official correspondence of the college and wrote most of its documents, generally in his own hand. He spoke for the college, preached to it, begged for it, thought for it, and castigated its members young and old for their own good...[5]

But Capen, himself a distinguished administrator of a complex university, points out many changes from the old order; changes that were dictated by the increase in the size and complexity of higher institutions. This growth, added to the movement toward the democratizing of all of our social institutions has wrought a number of changes.

The first of these conditions, the growth in size and complexity, has made it impossible for one person to maintain intimate contact with all phases of the work of a university. Hence, certain powers and authority must be delegated to other officers with considerable freedom of operation. For this reason the office of dean came to be recognized. Then there was a multiplicity of deans. Then came provosts, vice-presidents, registrars, comptrollers, and directors of this and that who found their places in the administrative family.

---

[5] Capen, Samuel P., The Management of Universities, Foster & Steward Publishing Company, Buffalo, 1953, p. 77.

The office of dean was first established about a century ago. The office was created in order that some one individual might provide essential relationship between the president and the faculty and students. One of the earliest descriptions of the powers and duties of the office of dean was provided by President Eliot,[6] of Harvard nearly a hundred years ago. After listing a number of specific duties, such as presiding at faculty meetings in the absence of the president, he concludes with: "...and in general to superintend the clerical and administrative business of the college."

After the office of dean had been generally accepted for half a century another great president, Andrews,[7] of Nebraska, wrote: "As universities grow in size and presidents are forced to relinquish teaching, the dean becomes the main copula between the business and the scholastic phase of university activity."

The second factor that has made for change is the movement toward democratization of our social institutions. Participation in the making of decisions that affect the college or university involve many more persons and groups than the casual observer may surmise. The faculty, acting as a whole as well as through its various committees, provides the president with information as well as decisions on academic matters. The student body through its campus organizations provides a channel for interchange of information regarding the needs and desires of the students. The alumni, through their officers and other representatives, convey to the president information concerning the institution from the viewpoint of the graduate.

There is rather general agreement among the writers on higher education that with the growth in size and complexity the ability of the faculty to perform vital administrative functions has decreased. Ruml points out factors affecting administration as follows:

---

[6] Eliot, Charles W., Annual Reports of Harvard College for 1869-1870, p. 12.

[7] Andrews, E. B., The Organization of the University and the Distribution of Authority and Function Therein, Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities in the United States of America, 1907, p. 20.

> In short, the two central developments seem to have compounded the difficulties. The faculty and curriculum were fragmented by specialization and departmentalization. Strong leadership was needed to direct and control the forces at work, to blend the elements of new and traditional strength without yielding essential character. A greatly strengthened presidency might have met this need, as indeed it was met by exceptional men at various times in various institutions. In retrospect, however, it appears that the President's responsibilities grew too rapidly to be manageable, concurrently with the disappearange of a coherent curriculum and a unified faculty.[8]

Governing boards have developed and published statements of policy that must stand the test of public scrutiny. The president, of course, works within the limitations of these policies. The change in this aspect of university administration has been notable during the past 25 or 30 years.

The tendency for boards to particularize regarding presidential powers and duties has been especially noticeable in the junior college field. Similarly, the tendency for the board to perform administrative functions is evident in junior colleges. One reason usually assigned for this condition is that the junior college is a local institution with a local board. If interested as board members, they often tend to devote their attention to details of management rather than to policies. Conceivably, one of the most important aspects of administrative leadership is that of keeping the board properly informed on the one hand and of maintaining proper professional relationship with them on the other.

Probably one of the most highly critical and at the same time most difficult problems of the president is that of delegating to responsible associates the responsibility for the details of administration. It is one thing to "know what is going on" and to have specific plans for meeting the day-to-day administrative needs. It is quite another thing for the president to try to attend personally to the details of administration. "Looking after nuts and bolts" is one characterization. "Wearing one's self out with administrivia" is another.

---

[8] Ruml, Beardsley and Morrison, Donald H., Memo to a College Trustee, McGraw-Hill, 1959, p. 50.

The over-all grand strategy; the long-time educational plan; public relations that take account of long-time plans,--these are essential elements that characterize the essence of administrative leadership. In order to have the time and energy to devote to such leadership the president must delegate the details of management to competent assistants. But even with the necessary delegation of authority by the president to his administrative associates, and with the greatly increased participation of the faculty in the shaping of the educational program, the fact remains that, at base, the responsibilities of the president are essentially the same as they have always been. Such changes as have taken place have been in the delegation of specific functions to be performed by administrative officers who are responsible directly to the president. Such an arrangement leaves the president more time to do those things which cannot be delegated to someone else. Of such things, there remain more than any president can do to his satisfaction with the time and energy at his disposal.

Among the many writers who have attempted to summarize the duties and responsibilities of the president, there is striking agreement. One of the more recent writers is Raymond Hughes. After long and successful experience in two substantial higher institutions, during which time he was an ardent student of higher education, he epitomizes the work of the president in the following words:

> No complete list of his duties can be made. The President is, or should be, the chief servant of all, always willing to help student, professor, employee, or any others needing his aid in their work or trouble. His authority is considerable, and he can be the most helpful man in the institution.

The literature reviewed appears to be in general agreement on one major point: whether the president delegates much or little of administrative authority, he can never delegate his responsibility.

But a president, conceivably, could do most of the things we have referred to and still not necessarily be characterized as an administrative leader. He may merely succeed in "holding the car to the road," at least until he comes to a troublesome intersection. He must have an educational philosophy that is sound and defensible. He must be able to keep the larger objectives in view when others do not see them.

A pertinent observation by Joseph M. Ray appears in the July issue of the Educational Record as follows:

Many factors bear upon the development of a college; the community, whether it is static or growing, arid or humid, urban or rural, agricultural or industrial, active or lethargic in college affairs; the student body, whether it derives from near or far, is largely homogeneous or varied in national origins, attended good or poor elementary and secondary schools; the administrative and supervisory system, whether it exercises more or less vision and obtains more or less financial support at the right times and in the right places. These factors and many others provide a continually moving, tightly woven fabric of institutional life that proceeds from the day of founding until the moment at hand. The future, some sort of future, seems always assured but the precise course it will take depends for details upon the interaction of many forces that impinge upon the life of the college.

In the face of these observations, let us reflect for a moment upon the impact that a president has upon an institution. Before his course and that of the institution met, the college had a full and established institutional life, and there is little he can do to change it. He and not the institution must make the major adjustment. In very real measure he becomes the prisoner of his frame of reference. Too strenuous effort to escape from this administrative prison would almost certainly result in the loss of his effectiveness.

A real leader will recognize these limitations and then, patiently and persistently move in the direction of the "Grand Plan" which is in his mind at all times. If checkmated or slowed down at any point he moves in other phases where movement is possible.

Our remarks have been mainly upon administrative leadership within the institution. Another important chapter has to do with educational leadership outside and beyond the limits of a single institution. The obligations of the administrator must reach beyond his own immediate sphere of action. But that is another chapter.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD AND ITS RELATION TO THE COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR

Doak S. Campbell

Under our system of control of education a governing board, usually designated as a board of trustees, is essential. Such a board may be a corporate entity that owns an institution, as is the case in many private institutions; or it may be the duly elected or appointed body that represents ownership and control by the people. In either case it must be recognized that the governing body has plenary powers limited only by the constitution and the laws under which it operates.

Boards of trustees vary greatly as to size, composition, method of appointment, definition of powers and duties, and limitations within which they perform their duties and responsibilities. Each of these variables can mean much in relation to the effective performance of duty.

The most critical factor concerning the relationship of a board to the chief administrative officer is the extent to which the board considers its responsibility to be that of policy making, and the corollary, the extent to which it avoids dealing with administrative details.

Junior college boards present some peculiar problems, although, in the main, they are not significantly different from other educational boards. They vary greatly from state to state. For example, in Georgia most of the public junior colleges are under the administration of the Board of Regents of the University System. On the other hand, in several states junior colleges are more closely related to the public school system. These varieties of administrative arrangements tend to dictate the types of relationships between the board and the president.

All of these remarks are by way of saying that there are many conditions that confront a president in his relationships with the official body that exercises legal control over the institution over which he presides. The following observations are presented without regard to any necessary sequence. They are meant to be practical. If at times they seem to be a bit didactic, please be patient.

By far the most important single duty of a board of trustees is that of selecting, appointing, and establishing proper working relations with the president of the institution. Having taken this important step, the board must look to this officer for educational leadership, and for the administration of the institution within the policies established by the board under the law. They must look to him to initiate matters affecting every aspect of the operation; educational, fiscal, and operational. The board may or may not approve recommendations of the administrative officer, but in no sense should they initiate actions except as required by law, or where the status of the administrative officer is under consideration.

Most boards tend to follow procedures that have been developed through the years and which have been accepted without much critical study or review. Naturally, a newly-elected president should not endeavor to make any radical changes in board procedure until after he and the board have developed mutual confidence and respect to the point that they can discuss such matters freely.

A consideration of great importance is that the president must know his board. He must know them as an official body and also as individuals. One highly desirable means of becoming acquainted with the board is to review the record of their actions for a period of three or four years. If at all possible, a person who is negotiating with a board with a view to appointment as president should study the minutes of the board before he gives his final commitment to accept appointment. It is conceivable that in some situations the board's procedures are such as to make it extremely difficult to operate the college on a proper professional basis. If the minutes reveal actions that have to do with the details of management and administration, caution is indicated. In such cases it would be wise to raise a question covering this point before agreeing to accept appointment.

As to knowing the individuals who comprise the membership of the board we need to be quite specific. In the first place, we mean that the president should know a good deal about them as individuals. What are their predominant interests--business, social, professional, and, in many instances, political? What are their backgrounds educationally and socially? Do they represent any particular interest or group? What are their peculiar qualifications for board membership--their peculiar deficiencies or weaknesses?

Now these things are not easily ascertained. One must accumulate the desired information and revise opinions from time to time. One's estimate of a board member is an extremely confidential matter not to be shared with anyone.

Also, the president must know the board members as fellow citizens of the community and as friends. That is, the president should be friendly in a genuine way with all of his constituents, including board members. It should be remembered, however, that in a very real sense, the president is always "in character." He is not just another respected member of the community. Because of this fact, friendships with board members have certain necessary limitations. Whatever else may happen, whatever the president's personal likes or dislikes of individual members, all board members should be on an equal footing. This does not mean that with some he may not be more congenial than with others. But it does mean that there can be no favorites.

This brings us to a point of great importance; the president does not become chummy with any board member. In fact, we are inclined to broaden the base of this precaution and say the president does not become chummy with anyone.

The public quickly senses the difference between the professional and the personal relationships of the president, but they are just as quick to attribute personal influence to his professional actions if he seems to be on intimate terms with any board member.

Fortunate is the president whose board chairman is a recognized leader in the community. Discussions with such a chairman can be had without necessarily incurring the displeasure of the other members. With a weak chairman, however, it is better to have all discussions that relate to college business at regular or called meetings of the board.

It must be recognized that there is a fine line between being friendly or chummy on the one hand and being cold and aloof on the other. To find that fine line and maintain it successfully often seems to require a "sixth sense."

The functions of the trustees, the president and the faculty are admirably set forth by a veteran administrator, Raymond M. Hughes. He summarizes these functions as follows:

> The trustees control all financial and property matters and determine general policies. The president administers the institution under policies fixed by the trustees. The faculty controls teaching and research and is responsible for academic standards.[1]

---

[1] Hughes, Raymond, A Manual for Trustees, Iowa State College Press, 1943, p. 12.

The policies under which the president and the board operate should be clearly stated and should be a matter of public record. If a comprehensive statement has not been formulated, then it is desirable that the president lead the board in the development of such a statement.

The president should be free, of course, to recommend any changes in policy that he deems desirable. The board should give full consideration to such recommendations but is not bound to accept them.

Two unhappy extremes are sometimes found as to this relationship: (1) the board serves as a "rubber stamp" for approving whatever the president proposes, or (2) the board undertakes to deal with the minutiae of administration and management. Such extremes are to be avoided like a plague.

While there are many aspects of the relationship between the board and the president that have not been included in this discussion those here included appear to be basic.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENT AND THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

*Raymond E. Schultz

This address is limited to considerations of administrative leadership bearing directly on instruction and as such preclude direct concern with curriculum. This in no way implies a lack of concern with curriculum; rather the delimitation has been made in an effort to develop some degree of depth in the presentation.

There are undoubtedly numerous logical ways that the major considerations of the junior college president's operational responsibility for the instructional program could be organized. This presentation is organized around four major topics: (1) staff selection, (2) personnel administration, (3) identifying and solving instructional problems, and (4) the in-service program.

Instructional Leadership in Staff Selection

Having served in a professional placement capacity at a major university for several years, I have some very definite opinions about staff selection and consider myself qualified to speak with some degree of authority on the subject.

As a placement official, I had an excellent opportunity to observe the employment practices and techniques of a great many college and public school officials. The variations could hardly have been greater, ranging from some administrators who consistently made wise selections as result of their employing sound procedures, to others whose batting averages were terrible and who consistently violated nearly every recommended recruitment and employment procedure.

Staff selection involves a three-stage process: (1) recruitment, (2) evaluating applicants, and (3) entering

---

*Dr. Raymond E. Schultz is Professor of Higher Education in charge of junior college education at Florida State University. He is also serving as co-director of the Southeastern Junior College Leadership Program which is being sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation. Dr. Schultz holds the Ph. D. Degree from the University of Wisconsin and was on the faculty at the University of Illinois prior to coming to Florida State University.

into the employment agreement. This last one is not considered here since it is only remotely related to the topic under consideration.

Recruitment. The inexperienced administrator will probably profit from studying the recruitment practices of institutions which have consistently strong instructional programs. They employ a variety of recruitment procedures for locating good potential applicants rather than depending upon applicants who seek them out. Not only do these administrators maintain close contact with college and university placement directors, deans, department heads and professors, they also commission members of their staff to "bird dog" for them. These administrators often keep a "little black book" in which they record the names of persons brought to their attention who appear to be worth keeping in mind for future staff needs. If you discover that a member of the staff of such an institution is on your campus, keep your good instructors under cover!

A second procedure consistently followed by such administrators is the preparation of a job description for each position to be filled. This description spells out the duties and opportunities of the position and the qualifications needed to fill it. The dean and department head or chairman where the vacancy exists usually participate in the preparation of these descriptions. Aside from its value for recruitment purposes, a well-formulated job description also provides criteria for evaluating applicants.

Screening Applicants. The first task in screening applicants is securing sufficient information on which to make valid judgments. In an effort to accomplish this, some administrators use a standard application and recommendation form. This procedure produces problems, however, particularly where there are a number of applications. In addition to the time and effort required to collect such information, it frequently produces false hopes for the individual who feels that he is receiving serious consideration when this may not be the case at all.

Another problem, of which administrators sometimes appear unaware, is the number of recommendations required in such cases. It can become an imposition on former employers and professors when a person seeking a position applies at a number of institutions, each of which in turn contacts the same employers and professors for recommendations. This is especially irritating when a recommendation on the applicant has been submitted to the college placement office.

A procedure which avoids much of this difficulty is to screen applicants on the basis of the information obtained from the college placement records, thereby reducing the number of applications to two or three of the most promising ones. If an applicant has not taken the trouble to get up-to-date materials on file in a placement office, he should be informed that he will not be considered as an applicant until such records are available. Many administrators would profit from making better use of college placement offices.

If standard application and recommendation forms are employed, the two or three applicants remaining after the initial screening can appropriately be instructed to complete them. If such institutional forms are used, the information which they solicit should be critically examined. Some of the ones I see suggest that this has not been done. Especially does this seem to be the case in junior colleges that are part of local public school systems. Observation leads me to conclude that some of these junior colleges are using without adaptation the forms which were developed for the elementary and secondary schools. As a result, they solicit information that has little relevance for judging the qualifications of a junior college instructor, and at the same time fail to collect other needed information.

I hope that as recently appointed junior college presidents, you will critically examine the application and recommendation forms used at your institution. It was a real temptation to include some horrible examples that I have collected, but instead I decided that it would be more beneficial to show the types of information that an application and recommendation form used by a junior college should solicit. There will, of course, be other information that some institutions will want to obtain. Appendixes A and B consist of an application and a recommendation form which I have drawn up to illustrate the type of information a junior college should find especially valuable and a format that has proven effective for soliciting it in an accurate and useful fashion.

Interviewing Applicants. There are two distinctly different types of employment interviews. One is the "inquiry interview" where an individual in search of a position either requests an interview or simply shows up at an administrator's office. In either of these cases the administrator can appropriately decline to grant the interview, and when a person appears unannounced maybe should. I impress upon graduate students that arriving without an appointment and uninvited at a president's or dean's office is indeed poor professional taste.

The other type of interview, which constitutes the final step in the evaluation of an applicant, I choose to call the "employment interview." It is initiated by the administrator and used where an applicant is being seriously considered for employment. Consequently, the applicant should be reimbursed for expenses which he incurs unless laws or board policy preclude doing so, in which case this fact should be made perfectly clear when the invitation is extended.

When an applicant is invited to a campus for an interview, and this should be done whenever possible rather than conducting this employment interview on a college campus or elsewhere, certain preparations should be taken in advance. First, the president should make sure that he, the dean, and the department chairman or head where the vacancy exists each has a period of time to spend with the applicant. Second, these other staff members should have had an opportunity to review the applicant's records and concur in the decision to invite him. Third, the role that each will play in the interview should be decided in advance.

An effective interview accomplishes two goals. It enables the president and his staff to learn some things about the applicant that are difficult to assess by other means and it provides an opportunity to interest the applicant in the institution. Also, it may result in the applicant deciding that he would not like the institution and/or its setting, in which case this often proves fortunate for both him and the institution.

Among the information which the interview should provide about an applicant are (a) his convictions about teaching, (b) his ideas on curriculum, (c) his understanding of the nature and role of the institution, and (d) by no means least, his personality. When it comes to interesting the applicant in the institution, a problem may arise with other members of the staff who also confer with him. Occasionally one of them will communicate an attitude that says in effect "come here and be miserable with us." Nevertheless, the advantages to be gained from having applicants confer with other staff members far outweigh the dangers.

There is a consideration relative to giving the applicant information on the status of his applicancy following the employment interview that constitutes a matter of ethics. While it is often not possible to give a final decision upon termination of the interview, the applicant should be told when he will be informed as to whether or not he will be offered the position. This should be as soon as possible after the interview but even where it may be as long as a month, he should be so informed. Many excellent applicants have been lost due to the failure of administrators to follow this procedure. By the time the administrator gets around to making a decision, the applicant has either accepted another position and/or interpreted the lack of definiteness as evidence that the institution is poorly administered and he has consequently lost interest.

Instructional Leadership in Personnel Administration

Many potential instructional problems can be prevented, and those which develope, overcome with sound personnel policies. No direct consideratbn is given here to the matter of who should be involved in making these policies. Rather, what follows represents an attempt to focus attention on personnel policies which have an important bearing on the instructional program.

Delegation of Responsibility to the Administrative Staff. Some of the most serious instruction problems that institutions experience can be traced to failure on the part of the president to assign and hold responsible for specified aspects of the instructional program other members of his administrative staff. Since instructional leadership should constitute a primary function of academic deans and department heads, a basic consideration in their selection should be a strong interest in and ability to provide this leadership. Beyond that, they should be made unmistakably aware of this responsibility.

Careful selection of the academic dean is especially crucial where instruction is not a major interest and/or cannot receive the primary attention of the president. Failure of a president to analyze himself in this respect and the subsequent selection of a dean who duplicates rather than complements his interests and abilities can leave a serious gap in an institution's instructional leadership.

Assignment of Instructional Staff. Policies relating to the assignment of instructional staff are too often based solely on the number of semester or contact hours. So many other factors enter into determining what constitutes a teaching load that the almost exclusive attention to hour load results in numerous instructional problems. Some of the other factors that warrant consideration are:

(1) The number of preparations required. A teaching load of 15 semester hours means something quite different with one preparation than where four or five preparations are required. It is hardly reasonable to expect the same quality of instruction in both cases.

(2) The number of student contacts. An example will best illustrate this point. Two instructors are each assigned a 15 semester hour teaching load and the same three course preparations but one has a combined total of 100 students and the other 200 students. They do not have equal opportunity to be effective teachers. If the first one is not doing a more effective job of instruction than the second, something is wrong.

(3) The planning required for a course. Consideration should be given to the fact that teacher preparation required for effective instruction varies from course to course. For example, the preparation needed for an effective class session of a conversational Spanish or algebra course will normally be less than that required for an effective class session of a biology or English course.

(4) The assistance provided instructors. Many of the numerous non-instructional duties associated with teaching can be adequately performed by student and secretarial employees. This can mean an appreciably lightened load that enables the instructor to perform more effectively his instructional duties. While students as laboratory assistants in science courses are quite common, they can be effectively used as assistants in virtually every teaching field performing duties that range from scoring examinations, to secretarial work, to doing reference work for the instructor. In addition to providing inexpensive and efficient assistance, student employment provides deserving students with much needed financial assistance.

(5) The type of activity required of students. The instructor of a written communication course who requires almost daily written assignments which in turn must be analyzed, has a substantially greater instructional load than the history instructor who only occasionally requires written work of his students. Administrators are coming to recognize this type of difference. One junior college, for example, calculates full teaching load for instructors of written communication at 12 semester hours with 20 students per class.

(6) Experience of the instructor. There is an understandable tendency for administrators to reward their loyal experienced instructors with a favorable teaching schedule. What may result, however, is that the young beginning instructor gets the "full dose" at a time when he is least prepared for it. Many of these young instructors are forced into ineffective patterns of teaching which they later find difficult to change. In

addition, an appreciable number are discouraged to the point of leaving the profession.

(7) Preparation of the instructor. While this factor does not relate as directly to teaching load as some of those just mentioned, it nevertheless warrants consideration. There is wide difference of opinion as to how much subject preparation an instructor needs to possess before he can competently teach a course. Opinions range all the way from the Ph.D. to no formal preparation. The fact of the matter is that there are variables which make it impossible to establish any given amount of formal preparation as essential. To do so ignores the fact that much of what anyone knows was not learned in formal courses as well as the fact that some instructors will work extremely hard to make up for a deficiency in background.

This means that an administrator must resort to individual judgment in deciding if a given instructor is qualified to instruct a given course. When doing so he should realize that (a) there are limits to which hard work will compensate for an instructor's deficiencies in background, (b) where deficiencies can be overcome by the instructor's hard work, this should be reflected in his teaching load or his other teaching may suffer, and (c) some instructors have an inflated opinion of their backgrounds and abilities and willingly accept assignments which they are not qualified to carry out.

Junior colleges with small enrollments obviously face a special problem in obtaining qualified instructors for the offerings which they feel should be provided. Nevertheless, the cause of education may be best served when an administrator refuses to offer courses for which qualified instructors are not available, even when this means sending students to senior colleges before they complete two years of junior college work.

Some administrators, while well aware of the factors just cited, feel that they cannot be considered in computing instructional load for reasons of faculty morale and finances. As for concern with impairing faculty morale, this is more an imagined than real problem when an administrator makes sure that policies affecting the faculty are interpreted to them. While the financial concern cannot be as easily dispensed with, the administrator who is committed to quality instruction must do everything possible to provide conditions conducive to it.

Acknowledgment of Effective Teaching. Our knowledge of the factors that produce motivation supports the assumption that ackonwledgment of good teaching contributes to a strong instructional program. The issue as to whether or not it is possible to identify the best teachers on a faculty seems to me to be summarized by the person who said, "Everyone knows who the best teachers of a faculty are but nobody wants to name them." We would strike a victory for good instruction if this reluctance were overcome.

When reference is made to recognition for good teaching, it is typically assumed one means financial reward forgetting that some of the most effective types of recognition from a motivational standpoint are not financial. Among the points that an administration should consider in the acknowledgment of effective teaching are as follows:

Financial rewards. Financial rewards in the teaching profession are by no means new as one might be led to assume from current professional literature on the subject. Until salary schedules became vogue, most public school systems employed an informal type of merit salary schedule and most colleges and universities never did depart from this practice.

An unnecessary dilemma seems to have been created over this issue. Extensive effort has been expended unsuccessfully in an effort to satisfy those who demand objective evidence of superior teaching as a condition for merit salaries. We would do better to concentrate on composite judgments of teacher competency made with all the wisdom and evidence at our disposal rather than straining to produce proof which is probably not forthcoming. No apologies need to be made for doing so. Such a procedure does not differ substantially from the one employed by teachers when they render judgments on their students in the form of grades.

I am firmly of the opinion that in the absence of salary schedules established by law, good teachers should be rewarded financially as one means to avoid a situation which encourages poor instructors to remain at an institution and good ones to go elsewhere.

Non-financial acknowledgments. As important as financial rewards are in promoting good teaching, they alone are never sufficient. Acknowledgments of a non-financial nature are frequently underestimated in their value for motivating teachers to strive for excellent performance. Some of the most effective of these are very informal in nature consisting of no more than well deserved compliments paid teachers both in private and public. Too often, it seems to me, administrators are prone to limit discussion of teachers' work to matters involving their difficulties and shortcomings. When an instructor comes to his dean or president bursting with enthusiasm about something he has done or is planning to do, an ideal opportunity is present for that administrator to express his interest and appreciation and to offer special assistance to the teacher for carrying out his plans if it seems needed.

There are those who contend that practices such as "Teacher of the Year Award" are too limited in the number of teachers they reach to be effective. There is basis for this contention where such an award represents an isolated effort to recognize good teaching, but this need not be the case. Some institutions have at least partially overcome this limitation by giving awards to teachers within categories such as teaching field or length of service. There are doubtless numerous other possibilities that can effectively be employed to broaden the base for granting such awards.

In summary, when combined with the other procedures that have been mentioned, non-financial awards--even when limited in scope--perform a worthwhile role in the promotion of good instruction. The very fact that their use points up to students, the profession, and the general public that outstanding teaching is worthy of special recognition is sufficient reason to employ them.

Instructional Leadership Through Identifying and Solving Instructional Problems

An institution which employs a continuous effort at improvement will almost certainly be upgrading its instructional program. By contrast, an institution which takes action only when difficulties reach the emergency stage is likely to find instructional problems cropping up all over the place. As a result, the administration is so busy "putting out fires" that conditions which produce the problems fail to get attention. In short, an institution cannot progress far without an in-service program.

Basic ingredients of any effective in-service program are "evaluation" and "implementation" with "evaluation" providing the evidence, and "implementation" the improvement measures. Conducting this evaluation requires a program of institutional research. Some of you heard the well received address on this topic by my colleague, Hugh Stickler, at the American Association of Junior Colleges Convention in Washington this past March. That address appears in the 1961 Convention Issue of the Junior College Journal under the title "The Expanding Role of Institutional

Research in American Junior Colleges."[1]

Evaluating the Instructional Program. While it is difficult to separate instruction and curriculum in the process of evaluation, the suggestions which follow identify the sources and types of evidence that are especially helpful for evaluating the instructional program.

The professional staff as evaluators of instruction. We pay a severe price in education for the prevalent attitude that an instructor's classroom is his sacred private domain. Many beginning instructors very much need and desire assistance for improving their instructional procedures. In institutions where the administration takes seriously its responsibility for a strong instructional program, these difficulties are spotted through classroom visitations and conferences, and assistance is provided as needed. Apart from what this means for the instructional program, it salvages a significant number of potentially capable young instructors. Providing this assistance to new instructors emphasizes again the need for instructional deans and department heads who are capable of and interested in providing instructional leadership.

One of the most perplexing dilemmas that administrators encounter is the instructor, more often than not the beginner, who equates high teaching standards, i.e., good instruction, with high failure rate. As Dean Seidlin of Alfred University Graduate School says, they associate "high standards" with "keeping them out" and "putting them out" and that the higher the standard the greater the "out-put".[2] Another person has expressed this situation by referring to it as the theory that "the more blood there is on the floor, the higher the standards."

Getting members of a faculty to realize that genuine high standards constitute achievement of the highest order for the greatest possible number rather than equating high standards with rate of failure is a problem which nearly every institution needs to tackle with an in-service program. The article by Dean Seidlin just referred to provides some good food for thought on this problem.

---

[1] Stickler, W. Hugh, "The Expanding Role of Institutional Research in American Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, 31:542-48, May 1961.

[2] Seidlin, Joseph, "High Standards: Sacred and Profane," Mathematics Magazine, 23: 189-92, March-April 1950.

Students as evaluators of instruction. There is pronounced disagreement as to whether and how students should be involved in the evaluation of instruction. Those who advocate involving students say, "If you want to know how good the meal was, ask the customers and not the cook." The real issue is whether students can make valid judgments on the quality of instruction. Some who object base their disapproval on cases where students have been inappropriately used as evaluators. Matters relating to curriculum, course objectives, assigning of grades, and the like, are in this category. On the other hand, students clearly are in position to make valid judgments on such things as how well an instructor explains, makes assignments, stimulates interest, provides encouragement, and gives individual help.

In summary, a junior college administrator who is committed to developing a strong instructional program can hardly afford to disregard valuable information on strengths and weaknesses of the program that can be obtained from students. This does not require the systematic use of student ratings, though some colleges and universities have successfully used this procedure for years. One such institution is the University of Washington which has for 25 years employed systematic student ratings of instructors conducted by the administration. Personally, I do not favor having all students evaluate each instructor each semester. In the first place, this is not necessary, and further, when ratings are used in this way, they tend to become routine and lose their effectiveness. How student evaluations are employed in a particular institution is a decision that should be arrived at cooperatively by the administration and faculty. Deciding whether they should be employed, however, is an administrative decision and while a president may need to build an acceptance of the idea, a faculty should not be permitted to decide against their use. On the other hand, excellent evidence can be obtained without employing rating forms by conducting interviews with selected insightful students. In some situations this procedure may well prove wisest.

Former students and outside agencies as evaluators of instruction. This is an evasive area in which to seek evidence for evaluating an instructional program. Institutions which use such sources to obtain evaluative evidence need to be aware of their limitations and pitfalls. The follow-up procedure in education is much better adapted to evaluating curriculum than instruction. At best, in the realm of instruction it provides a generalized judgment tempered by time and therefore often fails to pin-point strengths and weaknesses.

The greatest abuse of this procedure is using it to evaluate junior college instruction by comparing it with senior college instruction. This is typically done by comparing the grades earned by students before and after transfer. No controls in terms of ability and background are used and, even worse, it assumes a quality of instruction on the part of senior institutions which, in too many instances, just does not exist. As a consequence, the junior college assumes that its instructional program is strong because students perform as well there as they do after transferring to senior institutions, never stopping to realize that instruction may be poor at both places.

Probably the most reliable evaluations of instruction that can be obtained from former students are their reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. This is especially true of students who transfer to senior institutions which provides them with a direct basis of comparison.

Instructional Leadership Through an In-service Program

Inasmuch as most effective efforts at professional growth bring improvement in a variety of areas, the suggestions which follow are by no means limited in scope to instructional improvement.

Faculty meetings as an aid to in-service improvement. While commonly employed for this purpose, the faculty meeting often proves unfruitful as a means of promoting instructional improvement. Where faculty meetings are successful, certain conditions have generally been met. First, a steering or planning committee representing the administration and faculty is charged with developing a long-range program, usually covering at least an academic year. Second, each program is well planned with measures taken to help assure that assigned responsibilities are carried out. Third, it is made clear to the faculty that they are to attend. Fourth, meetings are scheduled at times other than the end of a busy day. Some presidents have had excellent success holding faculty meetings in conjunction with a meal paid for out of institutional funds. Even breakfast meetings have proven successful! Fifth, business meetings and in-service meetings are not intermixed. And finally, definite time limits are set and adhered to for meetings.

The professional library as an aid to in-service improvement. A well-chosen and up-to-date professional library can pay excellent dividends through its contribution to professional growth and improvement. The collection need not be large if it is wisely selected and accessible. Normally the best location is the faculty lounge. Development of the collection should be the joint responsibility of the faculty and administration with the librarian playing a key role.

Professional meetings as an aid to in-service improvement. If a president provided financial assistance and permitted his faculty to attend all scheduled professional meetings, he would both bankrupt the institution and rarely have any instructors in the classroom. Nevertheless, attendance at professional meetings does serve to improve a faculty and, consequently, the instructional program. Each faculty member should, therefore, be given some financial assistance for attending professional meetings.

While the extent of assistance that the faculty should receive can only be determined by the circumstances of the institution, two policies should be adhered to. First, funds for this purpose should be equally divided among the faculty. Exchange arrangements among the faculty will then make it possible for those who desire to attend meetings held at distant places to pool their shares and attend on alternate years. Second, the president should maintain a special fund, making possible faculty travel to special meetings where representation is in the best interest of the institution.

Some institutions employ what seems to me a good procedure with respect to the responsibility placed on those who attend meetings. They require each faculty member who attends a professional meeting with institutional assistance to make a report, written or oral, to the faculty as a whole or the department to which he is assigned as may be appropriate in each instance.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION

Attach recent
photograph
to this corner
if desired.

Return to: J. M. Richards, President
East Point Junior College
East Point, North Carolina

1. Date: ______________ (month) (day) (year)

2. Name: ______________ (last) (first) (middle)

3. Type(s) of position desired: (Indicate preferences in order)

____

____

4. Present Address: ______________ (street) (city) (state)

______________ (telephone)

5. If change of address is contemplated, indicate anticipated date of change and address thereafter.

______________ to ______________
(date of change) (street) (city) (state)

______________ (telephone)

6. Race: ______ Date of Birth: ______ Marital Status: ______
No. of Dependents: ______ Religious Preference: ______
Height: ______ Weight: ______

7. Graduate of ______ at ______ in ______
(secondary school) (place) (year)

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE IN POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS
(in chronological order)

	Institution	Dates Attended	Nature of Studies Pursued	Semester Credits and Degrees Earned
(a)				
(b)				
(c)				
(d)				
(e)				
(f)				

If you are now a candidate for a degree, when do you expect to receive it?

______________ (month) (year)

9. Academic Record: Give Grade Point Average figured to one decimal, i.e., 2.8 etc., with A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0, for each of the following: (Convert credits earned in quarter hours to semester hours.)

(a) Total UNDERGRADUATE GPA = ____________________.
(b) Undergraduate major of ________ semester hours in ______________ (subject field).
(c) Undergraduate minor (or equivalent) of _____ semester hours in ________________ (subject field).
(d) Undergraduate minor (or equivalent) of _____ semester hours in ________________ (subject field).
(e) Total GRADUATE GPA = ______ for ______ semester hours of work completed.
(f) Graduate major of _______ semester hours (when completed) in ______________ ______________ (subject field).
(g) Graduate minor of _______ semester hours (when completed) in ______________ (subject field).

10. Honors, awards and other recognition: (Those of special significance received in high school may be included.)

(a) Academic ____

____

(b) Leadership and Service ____

____

11. Scholarly and professional organizations in which membership is currently held:

____

____

12. Participation in activities and organizations: (include both college and community participation)

(a) Academic organizations ____

____

(b) Art, drama and speech, and music ____

____

(c) Sports and athletics ____

____

(d) Social organizations ____

____

(e) Civic and service organizations ____

____

13. Hobbies ____________________

____

14. List student activities in which you are interested and consider yourself qualified to sponsor or supervise. Circle those that you have directed.

____

____

15. Educational employment (in chronological order)

	Institution	Dates	Duties Performed	Highest Salary (9 mo. or 12 mo.?)
(a)				
(b)				
(c)				
(d)				
(e)				
(f)				
(g)				

16. Employment other than educational (in chronological order)

	Employer	Dates	Duties Performed	Highest Salary (Annual rate)
(a)				
(b)				
(c)				
(d)				
(e)				
(f)				
(g)				

17. Provide a brief statement providing significant information about yourself not covered elsewhere in this application and/or relate any special contribution that you feel you can make to this institution.

18. Attach copies of transcripts, reproductions of originals are acceptable, on college work completed. Provide a list of courses currently enrolled in and courses to be completed before beginning employment. (If this is not needed by the institution, have the applicant list the courses taken that relate to the position for which he is applying including those in professional education.)

19. List three references including the administrator in best position to judge the work of your most recent educational and other employment if you have held such employment. If a recommendation is on file elsewhere from any of these references, specify where.

	Name	Position	Address
1.			
2.			
3.			

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE

East Point Junior College
2741 Oak Heights
East Point, North Carolina

RE: Mr. Ralph Odis

We are considering Mr. Ralph Odis for a position as English Instructor at our college. Your evaluation of this person's qualification for that position will be helpful in reaching a decision on his employment. We will appreciate information that you can provide on as many of the following points as you feel qualified to judge him or her:

(1) PREPARATION for the above identified position, (2) SCHOLARSHIP and INTELLECTUAL CAPACITY, (3) EFFECTIVENESS as a teacher (or administrator), (4) COOPERATION AND DEPENDABILITY, (5) JUDGMENT AND MATURITY, (6) ATTITUDE TOWARD TEACHING and STUDENTS, and (7) PERSONAL APPEARANCE, MANNER, AND LANGUAGE.

Signature ____________________

Name typed ____________________

Position ____________________

Institution ____________________

This evaluation will be held in strict confidence. Use the reverse side of this sheet if additional space is needed.

DATE ____________________

SELECTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

*W. A. Hunt

It has been said often that the selection of a president is the first, and in many ways the most important, duty of the governing board of a college or university. Certainly it could be said that one of the major duties of the junior college president is to see that his institution is staffed with the very best classroom teachers possible for the salary the school is able to pay. In many respects this function of the president might be regarded as his primary responsibility. I remember seeing a sign in a bank recently which read something like this, "Money may not be the most important thing in the world but it is way ahead of whatever is in second place." At least I think this duty of the president could be classified in this same category, "...it is way ahead of whatever is in second place." The selection of instructional staff becomes a role of major importance when it is recognized that no college can be any stronger than its faculty. Classroom instructors possessed of such qualities as scholarship, enthusiasm for learning and instruction in the classroom, interest in the welfare and progress of students, and loyalty to the program of the college are what transform an ordinary college into a great institution.

Most of the presidents here today are from comparatively small junior colleges. I mean "small" in the sense that student bodies are not great in size and the faculty is small enough so that the president may become well acquainted with each member. The institution I represent falls in this classification. It has a student body of about seven hundred and a full-time instructional faculty of twenty-three. The plan which we use for the selection of instructional staff members has worked well for us. With the proper alterations it will work well in larger junior colleges. Let me make it clear at the outset that I claim no credit for the

---

*Dr. Anthony Hunt has been president of Howard County Junior College, Big Spring, Texas, since 1952. Prior to that he was with the State Department of Education in Texas. His doctorate degree was taken in junior college education at the University of Texas.

originality of our plan. We have studied what other colleges are doing and have tried to evolve a program containing what we considered the best parts of the plans studied.

The organization of our program for the selection of instructional staff was largely influenced by a policy of our Board of Trustees, requiring that all persons being considered for the position of instructor in the classroom must be personally investigated by a member of the administrative staff or by the department head concerned. Exception to this policy is made only when the person under consideration is well known to a member of the authorized investigating group. Such an information gathering visit becomes unnecessary.

In recruiting a new faculty member we try to get the largest list possible of persons available for the position. In the past we have secured our prospects mainly in one of the following ways: (1) recommendation from one of our own faculty members, (2) recommendation from graduate school placement bureaus, (3) recommendation by a professional friend on a high school or college faculty, and (4) direct applications by candidates. During my administration we have never employed knowingly an applicant recommended by a commercial teacher's agency. We would not fail, however, to consider a qualified applicant recommended by such an agency. When the list of prospective instructors has been completed, a committee composed of the Academic Dean, President, and Department Head concerned, meet and consider the information about each prospect. After careful study of college transcripts and other pertinent data, the prospect list is narrowed down to one or two persons. This action does not preclude the possibility of considering a more desirable candidate brought to the attention of the committee after its initial meeting.

The next step is a personal visit by the president, academic dean, or department head to the institution where the prospective instructor is employed, to his last place of employment, or, in the case of an inexperienced graduate, to the school conferring his latest degree. Prior to this visit, we have checked with the Retail Merchants Association or some other recognized credit association to see how the prospect has discharged his financial obligations. I am sure, at this point, many of you are thinking that such a plan is too expensive. You say, "How can we afford the money for these visits?" May I say in reply that such a plan will prove to be less expensive in the long run. Only one of the last fourteen people investigated and employed under this plan in our college has failed to be satisfactory. When the probability is considered that a person is being selected who will affect the welfare of hundreds of young people for years to come, the problem becomes one of a major investment. Then, there is the loss incurred from frequent or constant replacement. This may cost more in the long run than one carefully investigated placement that will last for years. None of us would want to make a personal investment without thorough investigation beforehand.

Our visit is usually divided into two parts: visiting with school officials and with merchants and other leading citizens in the community. It is surprising how much more you can find out about an individual during a personal call than by letter. I have found that many people, including school officials, will not put anything in writing that is derogatory either to the character or ability of an individual. The great fear is in being sued. I can recall many instances of receiving good letters of recommendation on individuals, only to find through a personal visit with the writers of these letters that they were afraid to put the real truth into writing. When they were interviewed personally, they refused to give a favorable recommendation. In a general sense these are the things with which we are concerned in investigating a prospective teacher:

1. Moral character.
2. Educational background and training; scholarship.
3. Ability to fit into the philosophy of the school.
4. Loyalty to present institution and administration.
5. Ability and success as a classroom teacher.
6. Ability to get along with other faculty members, students, and townspeople.
7. Initiative and self-reliance.

No attempt has been made to place these items in a sequence of importance, with one important exception. Moral character has been listed as the number one item for the simple reason that the investigation closes when we are told that our prospect cannot be recommended in this respect. We would not consider such a person in our system; therefore, it would be wasted effort to continue the investigation further.

When the person conducting the investigation returns home with a favorable report the applicant is invited by letter or telephone to pay a visit to our campus. We always pay the expenses of those to whom we extend an invitation to visit us. We feel that it is just as important for the prospect to visit us as it is for us to check him by visit. We want to be sure he will like us.

If he is married, we always invite him to bring his wife. I always try to arrange some time during the visit to have them in my home for a cup of coffee.

The head of the department under whom the prospect will teach is the one who takes charge of him when he arrives on campus. I first have a short interview with the applicant and then introduce him to the department chairman. The latter then introduces him to all the instructors in his department and gives opportunity for a short visit. In showing the prospective teacher over the campus, the department head will also introduce many other faculty members. After these visits the recruit is brought back to either the office of the dean or the president. The department head then goes back to check with the members of his department or division to see what their reaction is to the visitor. Upon receiving a favorable reply the department head asks the president to recommend appointment by the Board. We will neither recommend nor employ any prospective teacher unless recommended by the department head and accepted by the majority of the instructors in the department concerned. I always reserve the right to refuse to recommend a candidate even though he may be recommended by the department head. Let me say in passing that it has never been necessary for me to exercise this right.

As you will note, I have taken the practical approach in presenting our plan of selecting instructional staff members with a little of the philosophy back of each phase of the plan. I hope it has been of interest and of some practical value.

DEVELOPING AN IN-SERVICE PROGRAM
Summary of Remarks By
*James L. Wattenbarger

The need for a well organized and well conceived faculty in-service program is supported by several factors:

1. In studies conducted nationwide which questioned junior college presidents regarding the weakest point that they found to be of concern relating to the professional competence of faculty members, there has appeared repeatedly this comment: "Junior college faculty members do not understand, nor do they accept completely enough the junior college purposes and functions which have been evolved over the past 50 or 60 years." The implication for in-service improvement is clear.

2. Most regional accreditation associations, particularly the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, require an in-service program as an accreditation standard.

3. Junior college faculty members need to have brought to their attention new information regarding their particular level of education. Junior colleges are in a peculiar position in this regard, however, in that they usually have the faculty and staff which could carry out this function without additional outside help. The use of outside consultants is a very valuable aid in developing an in-service training program; however, most junior colleges have one or more individuals who have had direct experience in faculty in-service work, either as a member of a supervisory staff, or as a member of the teaching staff in a university. These individuals often can perform the same function.

A junior college in-service program should:

1. Provide for a better understanding and acceptance

---

*Dr. James Wattenbarger is Director of the Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education. In this role he has provided leadership for the rapid development of junior colleges in Florida. His graduate degrees were taken at the University of Florida where he later served on the faculty.

of the role of the junior college among the faculty.

2. Provide for a better understanding of the students.

3. Provide for a better understanding of the subject areas in the disciplines which are taught in the college and their interrelationship with each other.

4. Provide an opportunity for a faculty group to work together and aid in developing the essential _esprit de corps_ which is desirable in a college community.

Among the areas a junior college teacher should study in the in-service program would be:

1. The philosophy and role of the junior college.

2. Ways of organizing and the variety of administrative practices in junior colleges.

3. The junior college curriculum.

4. The psychology of post adolescent students.

5. The student personnel services problems as may be found in the junior colleges.

6. The variety of methods of teaching which may be used at this level of education.

7. The practical and direct experience that a junior college teacher should have prior to assuming full responsibility for teaching activities.

The problem areas which may be found in the development of an in-service training education program have been outlined by many people. For instance, Dr. Gleazer of the AAJC has outlined some areas, and I have borrowed heavily from these. The first problem is the difference between part-time and full-time faculty. It is essential that both the part-time as well as the full-time faculty participate in in-service improvement activities. This becomes all the more difficult when a large number of part-time teachers are employed. The numbers of part-time teachers, however, will increase rather than decrease over the next few years.

Second, the junior college teacher must adjust to conditions of teaching in a junior college. This often means that he must limit his work to the basic college level and may not develop advanced courses. It also means that a junior college teacher in a small institution may have to teach more than one subject.

Third, there is a need for training in the non-teaching responsibilities that a junior college teacher must carry. In small junior colleges, particularly in some of the privately supported institutions, teachers must carry responsibilities for dormitories, recreation, and in almost all junior colleges, the teachers must carry on the responsibilities for public speaking engagements, community survey work, and other community related activities.

Fourth, there is a need for improving the individuals who may be considered borderline employment possibilities. As the teacher shortage becomes greater, we will be employing more of these individuals. We have a choice of either helping these rather poor teachers to improve and become better teachers, or doing without a teacher at all in some instances.

Fifth, there needs to be constant study of the relationship between load and new teachers. There is a tendency to load the new teacher down with heavier classroom assignments than the older teachers may have. This comes at a time when in-service training is most important to these individuals. This fact may provide a difficult problem.

Sixth, there is often a wide divergence in the backgrounds of the faculty because of the very nature of the role of the junior college. The same faculty will have individuals representing both academic and technical and often vocational areas. A faculty in-service training program will seek to bridge these gulfs of differences.

Seventh, few teachers understand fully the student personnel services program of the junior college, and particularly the guidance services. All teachers must understand their responsibility in reference to this.

Eighth, there is a great deal of misunderstanding concerning institutional research activities which the junior college must carry on. The article by Hugh Stickler in the most recent issue of the Junior College Journal outlines ways in which institutional research can and should be carried on in the junior college.

Ninth, although they may be difficult to arrange, visits to other junior colleges comprise the most important part of faculty in-service development. To see other situations, to evaluate them in terms of your own may be a morale boosting factor as well as a learning method.

And finally, tenth, many colleges do not use consultants properly. A consultant should have a clear understanding of what he is supposed to do; he should be given an opportunity to do the job, and he should have an opportunity to plan ahead in his own personal relationship to the college. Consultants may be very valuable to the junior colleges and should be used as often as possible.

FACULTY POLICIES

*Charles R. Foster

Certainly one of the most important problems confronting every junior college president is the problem of how to maintain productive and satisfying relationships with the faculty. The same general problems which exist in the area of administration-faculty relationships in colleges and universities are evident in junior colleges as well.

A number of people have noted that even in a small junior college there is a tendency for faculty members to gravitate toward the senior college concept of faculty prerogatives. Faculty members in junior colleges, in other words, have a tendency to think of themselves as playing a role resembling that of the college or university faculty member rather than that of the faculty member in a high school. For this reason most of the things that can be said about college faculty members apply also to junior college faculty members.

Corson[1] has pointed out that there is an organizational dualism which is reflected in practically all college faculties, a dualism which on the one hand reflects what is considered the "scalar" principle of organization and on the other hand reflects the traditional faculty powers with which faculty members are usually entrusted.

The scalar principle is based on the idea that the power rests at the top with the president and then comes down successively through the dean, department head, and faculty member. Traditional faculty powers, on the other hand, are those generally entrusted to faculty members regarding many phases of the educational program, and

---

*Dr. Charles Foster is Professor of Education at the University of Florida. He is past national president of Phi Delta Kappa in which capacity he has done extensive travel and speaking, including a trip to Japan. Dr. Foster has his doctorate from Harvard with guidance being his area of professional interest.

[1] Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York: 1960.

most of these are traditional and not delegated. In many cases they have just developed without any special planning. In colleges, then, there are definite organizational principles resembling those found in any general business or industrial set-up (the scalar principle) and, on the other hand, there are responsibilities and powers which have come to rest on the faculty members just by virtue of tradition. This creates confusion as to where the faculty members' powers begin and leave off, and it produces the basis for conflict. It would be better if the allocation of powers could be more clearly identified and determined, and this might well be one specific recommendation to a new junior college president. It could be more readily done in a college which is newly organized than in an older institution where matters have become more crystallized.

In Corson's study of college government, he mentions several characteristics of faculty members which the junior college administrator might well study and bear in mind as he considers his staff relationships. A few of these are worth reviewing. The first one is that:

> ...the average faculty member has become during the past 100 years oriented more to his discipline than to his institution.[1]

This is a very important fact for the college president to remember. He must keep in mind the fact that the orientation of a faculty member is very largely to the subject field to which he feels a responsibility, and if there is a conflict between his loyalty to the subject and his loyalty to the institution, he will have a strong tendency to put the subject first in his thinking.

Corson also mentions a number of characteristics which he thinks are observable in college faculty members, including the following four which were brought out by Peter Drucker in an article in the Harvard Business Review ("Management and the Professional Employee", Harvard Business Review, May 1958, page 88).

1. The faculty member has a self-contained logic. He has a tendency to use intellectual processes that are different from the administrator.

2. He has certain ingrained working habits. Because he has been trained to work on his own, he insists on having complete control of the way he does his job.

3. He has objective standards which he applies to his own work instead of accepting the evaluation of a superior.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 29.

4. He regards the importance of conventional professional practices as the "very anthesis" of professional status.

Whether these observations are true or not, it is certainly a fact that some of them apply to some extent in the case of practically all college teachers. It is particularly noticeable that the college teacher feels as though he has the inherent right to be the sole judge of his own efficiency. Others have also pointed out the fact that we pay a great price in college education in order to preserve the dogma that what goes on in a college classroom is the professor's own business. Quite a few people are beginning to question the validity of this dogma and to bring forth the idea that perhaps it is about time for a change in this respect. Nevertheless, it is helpful to realize that faculty members tend to regard themselves as operating on the basis of a set of standards different from those which might ordinarily be applied to a worker in some other field.

There is another point which Corson makes which is interesting. He points out that professors are also committed to *values*. They are very much inclined to judge a problem in terms of the extent to which it is in harmony with what they consider to be ethical, or moral, or in accord with some intellectual principle having a high priority. As Corson suggests:

> ...a needed decision on a practical matter may be deferred until theoretical issues are debated.[1]

An instance is given in which a faculty of a large Eastern university was unable to decide on a curriculum for a program of public administration because of its disagreement on the fundamental role of the state in society.

It hardly needs to be pointed out that sometimes issues have to be decided on the basis of some practical operating principle, leaving ultimate theoretical aspects of the matter for later debate and decision. The administrator is more likely to see this as an imperative need and of course this might lead to differences of opinion in some cases.

While it is interesting to explore the various theoretical aspects of this problem, probably one basic principle stands out and that is the need for a rather clear delineation of responsibilities so that each group in the institution has a definite understanding of what its responsibilities are. When these lines of responsibility are clearly understood, people will usually make the necessary adjustments in their thinking to meet the working situations that come up from day to day and from time to time.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

One other thing that probably ought to be mentioned is the question of academic freedom. This seems to be one of the most frequent areas of difficulty and often results from a lack of understanding on the part of all concerned. The best way to meet this situation is to anticipate that problems may arise when they are least expected. Henderson[1] emphasizes the need for having definitely agreed upon principles and procedures to be followed in cases involving academic freedom.

College presidents would do well to read the review of this subject which Henderson offers. Perhaps the most important bit of advice here is that it would be well for the college president to set up a policy, and machinery for implementing the policy, before a fire breaks out somewhere.

Finally, I would like to turn to a set of guiding principles which I think can be just as valuable to a junior college president as they have been over the years to other people in positions of supervisory responsibility. I refer to the five basic points in the old job relations program as they were developed in World War II days by the War Man Power Commission. These simple precepts, widely observed in industry, can certainly be helpful to us all:

1. Let people know how they are getting along.
2. Give credit where credit is due.
3. Tell people about changes that are going to affect them.
4. Make the best use of each person's ability.
5. Never stand in a person's way.

---

[1] Henderson, Algo D., Policies and Practices in Higher Education. Harper and Brothers. New York, 1960. Pp. 208-209.

JUNIOR COLLEGE BUDGET

W. A. Hunt

Probably the most important single administrative job of the year is the preparation of the annual budget. The budget translates the educational program of the institution into terms of dollars. It must of necessity provide for a well-balanced distribution of support for all areas of activities and services of the junior college. It is necessary that the President of the college do a great deal of educational planning preceding the actual preparation of the budget. In order to plan wisely for the future, he may find it necessary to hold many conferences with the administrative staff, the business officer (if a separate office from the presidency), and with departmental deans or chairmen. When this background planning is complete the president usually presents a broad outline plan to the Board or governing agency for approval before work is actually begun on drafting the formal budget.

Assuming that the background work of planning the educational program has been completed, let us now turn to the actual preparation of a formal budget. May I offer for your consideration several points which may be helpful in preparing an annual budget?

Preparation of Budget

We actually have four budgets adopted or approved by our Board of Trustees each year: (1) an Educational and General Funds Budget; (2) a Student Housing System Revenue Fund Budget; (3) an Interest and Bond Budget for the retirement of indebtedness on tax bonds; and (4) an Interest and Bond Budget for the retirement of indebtedness on dormitory revenue bonds. I shall direct attention mainly to the preparation of the Educational and General Funds Budget since time will not permit study of all types.

In my institution the board holds me, the President, responsible for the preparation of the annual budgets. I am held responsible, also, to see that expenditures do not exceed budget allotments or that total expenditures do not exceed the total income. We generally amend our budget once or twice a year to reflect a more realistic picture of income and expenditures and to comply with Texas law. Our Board never approves more expenditures in any given year than the total amount of money shown in the income section of the budget. This, too, is in compliance with Texas law which requires that all expenditures shown in the Educational and General Funds Budget be paid in the year they were obligated. In other words this simply means that obligations in this area can not be extended more than one year. I believe this same law applies in most states of the United States.

Income

I always prepare the estimates in the income section of the budget in advance of those for expenditures. I try to make these estimates as realistic as possible since an unrealistic approach (over-estimation of income) will preclude a realistic approach to the expenditure section of the budget. Over-estimation may also result in serious damage to the educational program. Certainly the limits of the institutional program must be determined by the total available resources. My advice is to be conservative in listing income and exercise liberality in the section on expenditures, bearing in mind that total expenditures should not exceed total income.

The sectional headings in both the income and expenditure sections of an Educational and General Funds Budget follow rather closely the suggestions given in College and University Business Administration, Volume I.[1] The sub-headings were designed to meet the needs of a particular institution. A very helpful procedure, both in preparing the income section and submitting it for Board approval, is the use of three columns of figures after each item listed: Column I, the budget figure for the past year (amended budget); Column 2, actual amount spent for the current year; Column 3, the proposed amount for adoption in the new budget. Figures in Column 2 are ascertained by using the amounts spent to date in each item as shown from the accounting system, with the addition of any income in any account that may be expected to accrue in the remaining months of the current budget year. Incidentally, the accounting system should be set up in the same order as the budget, item by item. This system has been found most desirable, not only for budget comparisons with actual expenditures, but for making monthly financial reports to the Board.

In determining the anticipated income from tuition and fees it is helpful to obtain expected enrollment figures from the Registrar or Director of Admissions. The estimate should also take into account general economic conditions, trends in enrollment in the institution itself and in other institutions of comparable size located in the same general area.

---

[1] American Council on Education, College and University Business Administration, Vol. I (Washington, D. C.: 1952).

I have had no experience in estimating incomes from endowments. All my administrative experience has been in public junior colleges which had no endowment funds. I do know that endowments require thorough study before budget estimates can be made with any degree of accuracy. This fact is particularly true in the case of investments in stocks that tend to fluctuate.

Estimates of income from gifts and grants should be conservative. It is always a good idea, I think, to base this estimate on past experience where it is available. Other factors would be interest of alumni, definite plans for raising money, and prospects of research grants and contracts.

The estimate of the amount of money to be received from local taxes has never been too difficult for me to figure. I always ask the County Auditor for his estimate of the assessed valuation of the county. We use the same tax assessor-collector as the county and the same valuation that the county uses. I usually figure the same percentage of collection as that of the prior year (92% last year). We do not estimate the amount to be collected from delinquent taxes since we figure that this amount will usually take care of the cost of collecting current taxes. In large public college districts it is better to estimate the amount of delinquent taxes in a separate item.

The estimate for income from sales and services of instructional departments is obtained by getting estimates from the Departmental Chairmen. I always compare these estimates with what actually came in during the past year, to see if they are realistic. Great deviations in estimated collections, as compared with the current year, are checked with the Departmental Chairmen for possible error.

Estimates from income on auxiliary enterprises is determined by enrollment, probable volume of business in such enterprises as the bookstore, and by checking with the director of each auxiliary enterprise. Estimates are made on a gross basis.

Estimates of income from other sources are based on careful examination of past experience with proper adjustments for future conditions.

Expenditures

Expenditures in the Current Educational Operation Budget are classified by function as follows:

1. Administrative Expense
2. General Expense
3. Auxiliary Enterprises (Athletics - Men and Women)
4. Instructional and Departmental Research
5. Library
6. Plant Operation and Maintenance
7. Capital Expenditures
8. Contingency Fund
9. Fixed Charges

This organization of the expenditures section follows, in the main, the accepted procedure in college and university business administration. The only two exceptions are Auxiliary Enterprises and Capital Expenditures. The two items included under Auxiliary Enterprises are Athletics for Men and Athletics for Women. Athletics should pay for themselves but do not in this case. They are, therefore, included in the operating budget, both in the Income and Expenditure section. This is done in order to give a fair picture of the cost. Current funds for the purchase of new furniture, furniture repairs, purchase of new equipment, and campus improvements including street paving and other ground improvement are included in Capital Expenditures.

When the anticipated amount of income has been determined the Department Chairmen are called in for a conference with the President and Business Manager. This meeting is usually held in the first week of May. Forms are given to each chairman with the following spaces provided for budget requests from his department:

1. Estimated cost of teaching materials and supplies.
2. Itemized list of teaching equipment needed including cost of each item.
3. Request for plant equipment such as desks, chairs, filing cabinets, student desks or chairs, and any other classroom or office equipment (cost estimates are not required).
4. Suggestions for needed plant repairs.

It will readily be noted that no provision is made in the Departmental Request Forms for salaries of faculty members. We operate under a fixed salary schedule which makes this provision unnecessary.

Shortly after receiving the request forms each department head meets with the other members of his department to work out the details of the department budget request. I ask that this work be completed and returned to the President's office not later than the last week in May.

The Librarian is asked to make up his entire budget request following the items listed in the Library Section of the Educational and General Fund Budget. He is requested to present his estimate of library expenditures not later than the last week in May.

The Registrar, Academic Dean, and other administrative officers are asked to turn in requests for office supplies and equipment on a form provided for their use.

All other items not covered by budget request forms are determined in three ways: (1) from past experience as shown in the accounting system; (2) allowances made for additional buildings or services; and (3) conferences with departmental chairman where his department is concerned.

The first copy of the budget is then completed by the President and the Business Manager. If the Expenditures are more than expected income, the expenditure section of the budget is re-worked until the total equals that of the income section. Proportionate cuts are made in all departments in conference with departmental chairmen. I have found that this meeting with the departmental chairmen saves a lot of time as well as a lot of dissatisfaction in the faculty later.

Presentation and Adoption of the Budget

The budget document and the analyses are next presented for the consideration and adoption by the Board. The form of the analyses for Board consideration will, of course, vary widely among institutions. The governing Board must assume ultimate responsibility for the budget so it is important that they be supplied with adequate information for complete understanding of each item. However, the governing board should leave as many details as possible to the judgment of the President, and the Board should concentrate its efforts on major policies.

The first approval by the Board is a tentative one. The final Budget in our college is adopted at the public hearing (required by Texas law) held at least one month after the adoption of the Tentative Budget. Department Chairmen are provided with copies of the approved budget.

I hope this rather sketchy picture of how one school arrives at the annual budget will prove of some value to you.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

*Laurence R. Campbell

If I were a man from Mars, you would ply me with questions. Probably your first question would be: what are you doing here? I would say: I am here by chance, not choice. I would add: my space ship got out of control and lost its orbit. Result: I landed on this obscure planet.

Then I would ask you a question: what are you doing here? You would say we have been talking about the junior college--its problems--administrative, instructional, and the like. At this point I would interrupt you and say: just what is a junior college?

Luckily, I am not a Martian. I am a former student of San Jose Junior College. I am a former teacher at Menlo College and Yuba College in California. I studied the junior college in Dr. Walter Crosby Eells' class at Stanford. I wrote my master's thesis about a junior college subject field.

I know what a junior college is, and so do you. But does your public know what a junior college is? What is the image of the junior college which you have created in your community? And when the chips are down, will your publics be for you or against you? Is your public relations program in orbit?

Before you answer my question, let me conduct a poll in your community. Button-hole a businessman and say, "What is a junior college?" He says, "A place for dumb kids who can't get into university. What's more, it's cash gobbler--eats up tax money faster than a hungry hog at a swill trough."

I ask a barber the same question: "What is a junior college?" He says: "Drive out to the north side of town on Main Street. You'll see some scraggly bushes and stunted trees around a cluster of brick buildings. There's

---

*Laurence Campbell is a professor of English Education at Florida State University. He has an extensive background in public relations having taught journalism in junior and senior colleges, served as dean of a school of journalism, and written several books on journalism.

a sorry lawn in front. The flag on the flag pole looks as if it was used at Iwo Jima."

What is a junior college? I ask a high school teacher and he says: "I can tell you one thing: the faculty is a set of snobs--academic snobs. Worse yet, the teachers get paid more than we do for doing less than we do." His neighbor chimes in, "What's worse, they're parlor pinks; they teach communism."

Consult a parent and he replies, "I don't know whether my daughter's learning a thing, but she's having a heck of a good time. There's a meeting or party or dance every night." Another parent adds, "Some of those junior college kids are pretty wild. Don't see much of them in church, but they find the beer parlors."

What is the public image of your junior college? Perhaps your faculty holds up an invisible shield between you and your publics. Perhaps your secretary protects you from complaints and protests. When someone calls to object to your policies, she curtly says, "I'm sorry. The president is too busy to be disturbed."

One thing is true: the president is too busy. Another thing is true too: the president wanted the job. He took it with his eyes wide open. If he is too busy to be disturbed by public relations, sooner or later he may find that he may not be in a position to be disturbed by other challenges to leadership.

What is a junior college? There's no doubt in your mind about the answer, but can you be so sure that your public knows what your junior college is--what it is doing in your community? The success or failure of a junior college depends on its public relations, for inevitably its public decides its destiny sooner or later.

But what is public relations? Simply stated, someone has said, public relations is putting your best foot forward and keeping it there. It also may be defined as a planned program to win the good will and active support of one or more of a number of specific publics.

To be sure, in one sense your junior college speaks for itself. The quality of its performance from day to day commands attention--and may command respect. But who actually knows about the quality of performance? How can anyone know who wants to know or is entitled to know if the story goes untold?

Just what do you want your publics to know?

1. You want your publics to know what you are doing.
2. You want your publics to understand what you are doing.
3. You want your publics to approve what you are doing.
4. You want your publics to support what you are doing.

What are you going to do about public relations? First, you may do nothing. Second, you may do something now and then. Third, you may have a long-range year-around program of sustained and systematic communication with all your publics. The third possibility is the only possibility worth considering.

There are four steps in the public relations process:

1. First, the president studies the current situation. He asks himself these questions: Where am I? Where am I going? He determines what problems he must solve. He identifies the issues which command public interest and the decisions which demand approval and support.
2. Second, the president develops a plan. He has a plan for the future of junior college, of course. He also has a plan for its public relations--a plan that covers day-to-day as well as year-to-year provision for sustained and systematic communication with the public.
3. Third, the president puts the plan into operation. He establishes policies. He provides for the personnel, facilities, resources, and time needed to do what needs to be done. He assigns responsibility to others, but he also recognizes his own responsibility for public relations.
4. Fourth, the president periodically evaluates his plan. He asks himself, "How am I doing?" Perhaps he is not winning fast, fast, fast relief from the tensions that sometimes distract him and immobilize his teachers. In any event, he should review the past and assess the future.

Well, your junior college is good, but is it good enough? perhaps it is good, but is it getting better? Is it worth what it costs in dollars? The public asks these questions. It asks them in time when there is collision of ideologies, a struggle for survival, a threat of nuclear warfare.

Let's be blunt. Some of your public wants you to succeed, but some of it may want you to fail. We can name some of these enemies of the junior college. Some we may convert; others we must combat.

Who are they? First, there is the dollar lover. He likes to wield the economy axe. He likes to slash and slice budgets. He believes that the junior college is superfluous. If he can't kill it, he wants to starve it through financial malnutrition.

Second, there is the ancestor worshiper. His junior college would be a surrey with a fringe on top. He would adopt a traditional curriculum--perhaps classical, perhaps liberal, perhaps practical. He would freeze education into nineteenth century mould.

Third, there's the self-anointed expert. He's a Mr. Big in business, military, or professional affairs. He issues oracular edicts on education. He mentions Russia. He has a monopoly on the answers, and he's sure he's infallible.

Fourth, there's the academic assassin. He has an ego as big as a balloon. Sometimes he is a frustrated academician--bitter, vindictive, jealous and malicious. Sometimes he is an academic snob. In any event, he keeps a sharp dagger beneath his cloak.

Fifth, there is the communist. His purpose is to cause trouble. His method is to confuse, bewilder, and divide your publics. He has no moral scruples. He will tell some of the truth sometimes or he will tell lies big and small.

Whether or not you recognize these enemies, you can classify the people in the community into three groups so far as their attitude toward the junior college is concerned. Some are for it; some are against it; some are undecided. Certainly you want to hold to the loyalty of those who are for you, but you also want to win the others.

Why should anyone be against you? First, some of them simply do not understand what a junior college is, what its role is, what its service to society is. They may be ignorant, misinformed, misled. Others may be against you as a matter of principles or for any number of motives which may be the basis of human behavior.

Who is responsible for the selection, instruction, guidance, and placement of junior college students? The president.

Who is responsible for the selection, supervision, recognition, and advancement of employees--both academic and non-academic? The president.

Who is responsible for the efficient operation of the physical plant, the economic use of funds, the provision for library books and audio-visual equipment? The president.

Who is responsible for sustained and systematic communication to the publics of the junior college? The president.

Whatever is done about public relations will reflect the attitudes and interests, the background and the ability, the knowledge and understanding of the president of the junior college. This is a fact which is inescapable, no matter how big or how small the junior college may be in enrollment.

What should the president do? He should know his junior college and he should know his community. Both are made up of people, people who can share in a program of two-way communication. One-way communication is not enough, for a president must learn to listen as well as to be listened to.

Here are some steps to take:

1. Appoint a director of public relations. If you prefer the term community relations or public information director, it may be preferable in the community in which you live. Be sure the director is qualified. Be sure he knows what he is to do and not to do. Be sure he has the time, means and cooperation needed.

2. Appoint a faculty community relations committee. Again be sure the members are qualified, that they know what they are to do and not to do, that they have the time, means, and support needed for their work. Such a committee must be active, not passive; positive, not negative.

3. Establish a community cooperation committee. Persuade key people in the community who understand local public opinion to help develop effective two-way communication. They can help you to understand "inside Moline" or "inside Miami," "inside Meridian" or "inside Gaston."

4. Adopt a rifle policy, not a shotgun policy. That is, see to it that your program is designed to aim and hit specific targets, not just any targets that may happen to be in the way of your misguided missiles. To put it another way, know what you're doing before you do anything at all about public relations.

What do we mean by specific targets? We mean that the community really is made of a set of small communities. We mean that a public is made up of specific publics. Actually we can classify these publics as internal and external publics from all of which the junior college may seek understanding, approval, and support.

The internal publics consist of:

1. Students--full-time, part-time, day, evening, adult
2. Former students and alumni
3. Academic employees--full-time and part-time
4. Non-academic employees--full-time and part-time
5. Parents--local and non-local
6. Board of trustees

The external publics consist of:

1. Educational institutions and organizations in the community or nearby
2. News media--newspapers, television, radio, etc.
3. Business, industrial, labor leaders and organizations
4. Government--city, county, state
5. Professional organizations
6. Civic and service organizations
7. Youth-centered organizations
8. Spectators and audiences at junior college events
9. Ethnic groups, political parties, veterans' organizations
10. Church and community welfare groups

How do you communicate with your internal public? On the campus much can be done through face-to-face communication with students, with faculty, with staff at individual conferences, committee meetings, faculty meetings, student assemblies. Busy as a president may be, he should not remain cloistered in his office--like a skeleton in a closet.

Student publications can be effective if they are for students. They should have ample financial support and professional supervision. Quality newspaper, yearbooks, handbooks, and magazine can enhance the prestige of the junior college, but they should outshine comparable journalistic enterprises at the high school level.

As junior colleges grow in enrollment, the need for a weekly house organ with announcements for teachers and other employees becomes obvious. The junior college catalog may hinder as well as help in public relations. Leaflets, pamphlets, and brochures may be effective if words and pictures are used to communicate clearly.

The bulletin board--if regularly changed--is useful. Posters, displays, exhibits, and visual materials may be used on the campus. Significant events--outstanding lectures, concerts, and other kinds of programs--may stress quality and accordingly give the junior college prestige that its own students can recognize and appreciate.

The external publics of the community may be reached by the spoken word. The president has a telephone inches away. He has opportunities to make verbal announcements. He is invited to make speeches. He is a member of local committees of service clubs, chambers of commerce, and his church.

The president is a vital news source. He should cooperate fully with reporters from local news media. He should provide news for local news media whether these media seek it or not. His attitude toward newsmen may be one that wins or loses friends for his junior college.

Newspapers and junior colleges have a common interest. Both want the public to be informed on vital issues. The newspaper can succeed without the support of the junior college, but the junior college cannot succeed without the support of the newspaper. Leaders of both should work together for the community good.

The junior college president may have an opportunity to speak on radio or to appear on television. He may use audio-visual aids and equipment in public relations program. He may use direct mail or local mass media for advertising. He may schedule significant events that are open to the public as well as the students.

These are some of the tools and techniques of public relations. There are others. All have merit if they are a part of a long-range plan under responsible leadership. But each teacher must accept his role as a news source and cooperate in the dissemination of the news about the junior college.

The president, of course, should establish the objectives of his public relations program with the help of his faculty and community committees. Organization plans should provide for proper channels of command. Manpower and facilities should be adequate as well as time and budget.

If the program is to succeed, the public relations director should not be regarded solely as a news reporter. He may be concerned with internal as well as external public relations. He may be responsible for community services and special events. For example, he may operate a speakers bureau.

The working program should provide for a clear understanding of the scope of the public relations program. The activities may be classified with stated activities under each category. In some instances deadlines may be set up in the hope that certain stipulated objectives may be achieved within a given interval.

Every junior college president has a public relations policy. He may do nothing or he may do something. If he does something he should be sure of where he is, where he is going, and how he is going to get there. And from time to time he must pause to see how much progress he is making toward his destination.

At each step of the way honesty is the best policy. If the president plays by ear, he may feel the pulse of the public and know what the beat means. He may rely upon impressionistic and subjective evidence, balancing compliments and complaints, belittling some catcalls and playing up bouquets.

As an image maker the president may use polls and questionnaires. He may examine statistical evidence. He may note his problems in winning support for a desirable budget. He may measure the morale of his co-workers on the faculty and in the community. He may seek significant and substantial evidence to prove that progress is being made.

To sum up, let us note that every junior college president wants his publics to know what he is doing, to understand what he is doing, to approve what he is doing, to support what he is doing. If these goals are to be achieved, he must institute a sustained and systematic program of two-way communication.

The president is the key leader, but he needs the help of his co-workers on the faculty and the community. He needs a director of public relations who is much more than a news reporter. He needs to understand his immediate situation, to make a plan of public relations, to put the plan into operation, and to evaluate the plan.

It is true, of course, that all that the president knows about budgets and buildings, about guidance and instruction, about education or about people will be useless unless he has public confidence and support. Indeed his success in professional leadership depends upon his success in public relations.

Naturally we are interested in the success of the president. We are more interested in the success of the junior college. We want its story to be worth telling and we want it to be well told. No one is in a better position than the president to see that the public is informed.

Our cause is not that of the presidents. Nor is it wholly that of the junior colleges. It is the best cause of all--the cause of hundreds and thousands of young Americans pouring into the doors of our junior colleges, eager for the unique educational opportunity junior colleges are in a position to give.

Our cause, then, is the cause of youth, our richest resource. Our cause is youth, its destiny on the brink of a volcano of global world, its hope for a free world where the pursuit of happiness is more than a pursuit. Now is the time to ready our guided missiles. Now is the time to get our public relations into orbit.

GETTING ALONG WITH THE PRESS

*Miss Ruth Peeling

If you consider the press your friend rather than an enemy, you should have no trouble getting along with reporters. Since Sputnik I, education and educators are basking in a happier climate. Most newspaper people realize that their lifeblood depends on people being taught to read and to understand what they read in newspapers.

The ties between education and the press are very close. People of the press like to feel that educators respect them. Most of them will go out of their way to gain that respect. While the junior college president may think he is bending over backwards to "handle the press", the dedicated reporter is just as interested in keeping the junior college president happy.

If you want reporters to publicize your college when things are going well, don't slam the door in their face when (or if) your basketball players are accused of taking bribes or the college paper stirs up a hornet's nest in the community. The best policy is to be honest with reporters.

If a reporter handles a story that is to your liking, thank him; if the paper is doing a good job in helping you raise funds for the college, write a letter of thanks to the editor. Cocktail parties and luncheons are not required to express gratitude to the press. Gratitude can be expressed in ways (letters and words of praise) that are not costly and do not obligate the reporter.

If you build up friendly, personal relationships with members of the press, you should have very few public relations problems.

---

*Miss Ruth Peeling is executive editor of the Carteret County News-Times in Morehead City, North Carolina. A Pennsylvanian by birth, she received her bachelor's degree in journalism from Syracuse University and her master's degree from Florida State University. She has worked on both daily and weekly newspapers and always has been interested deeply in the interpretation of education to the public.